

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
EUREKA DIVISION

GARY FARRIS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

3M COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-04186-JST (RMI)

ORDER ON MOTIONS

Re: Dkt. Nos. 207, 208

Before the court is a joint discovery letter brief (dkt. 207), and an *ex parte* discovery letter brief (dkt. 208). The point of the latter is to explain that the former was not properly filed as “joint” and to include information and exhibits missing from the “joint” letter. Indeed, counsel for Defendant Toshiba America Business Solutions, Inc., asserts that the “joint” letter brief was filed in violation of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the local rules, and violated his trust in opposing counsel.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that counsel for Plaintiff shall, on or before November 21, 2019, file a response, explaining why the motion should not be denied as in violation of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the local rules. After the response, the court will determine whether the “joint” discovery letter brief will move forward and set a hearing date, or whether the court will set a hearing at which Plaintiff’s counsel will show cause as to why sanctions should not be imposed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 18, 2019



ROBERT M. ILLMAN
United States Magistrate Judge